



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,045	03/24/2005	Celestin Sedogbo	4590-387	6233
33308 7590 05/07/2009 LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP 1700 DIAGONAL ROAD, SUITE 300 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
SEYE, ABDOUK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2194				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,045

Applicant(s)

SEDOGBO ET AL.

Examiner

Abdou Karim Seye

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/25/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

(i) " the system", in line 9 and 14; " the service", in line 15; "the context of use" in line 14 , claim 1

(ii) "the container" , claim 2-3.

(iii), "the system", claims 4,8 and 9

(iv) "the interaction context" , "the expected service", claim 5.

(v) "the interaction services", "the domain of application", "the task", " the terminal", claim 7.

(vi) "the container device", claim 6.

B. The following claims language is unclear and indefinite:

(i) As per Claim 1, line 13, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "the representations", the claim recites all interaction representations in lines 6-7 and in line 9, representations of modes of action and it is not clear if the representations recited in the claim refer to the representations in all interaction representations or to the representation in representations of modes of action or in both? Appropriate clarifications are required. In lines 14-15, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "this representation", the claim recites representation of the terminals in line 8, representation of activity in line 10, and in lines 13-14 a structured representation and it is not clear if this representation recited in the claim refer to the representation in representation of the terminals or to the representation in a structured representation or in both? Appropriate clarifications are required. In line 15, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "the application", the claim recites user-system interaction independent of an application in lines 1-2, and in lines 3-4 at least on representation of an application and it is not clear if the application recited in the claim refer to the application in user-system interaction independent of an application or to the representation in at least on representation of an application or in both? Appropriate clarifications are required.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 5-6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by De Angelo (US 7010536).

6. As to claim 5, De Angelo teaches the invention as claimed including a device (FIG. 2B/2B1) for user-system interaction independent of an application and of interaction media in a system of type having at least one man/machine interface ("site 4", FIG. 2B1), at least one applications server ("Site 2", FIG. 2B1) and one database ("gateway storage", FIG. 2B1), comprising:

a single container device (FIG. 5; col. 15, line 60; col. 17, lines 1-15) in a four-tier architecture (col. 17, lines 10-12, wherein the database is the four-tier) for all interaction representations, configured to store at least one of the representations of the interaction context including: representation of the modes of action, representation of the modes of perception of the exchanges of information by the users, representation of activity of the users, representation of context and representation of the expected service (abstract; col. 4, lines 8-20; FIG. 5, col. 16, lines 1-10); col. 20, lines 33-43).

7. As to claim 6, De Angelo teaches, wherein the container device comprises a subset for analyzing events represented by the actions of users on interfaces (FIG. 10; col. 22, lines 26-35), a subset for taking account actions of users and for managing interaction (col. 22, lines 56-67; 200, FIG. 4), a subset for communicating with the applications server (col. 23, lines 1-13), a subset of filters, an adapter and mode selector subset and a subset of converters for usage interfaces (FIG. 4, col. 14, lines 25-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-4 and 7-13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as unpatentable over De Angelo (US 7010536) in view of Kautto-Koivula et al (US 20030117436).

10. As to claim 1, De Angelo teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for user-system interaction independent of an application and of interaction media (abstract; FIG. 2A/2B1), the user-system having at least one computing layer ("site 2", FIG. 2B1) supporting at least one representation of a terminal ("site 4" FIG. 2B1) and at least one representation of an application ("site 3", FIG. 2B1), and having at least one user interface ("gateway storage", FIG. 2B1) itself supporting a piece of software, comprising the steps of:

creating a single container (FIG. 5; col. 15, line 60; col. 17, lines 1-15) in a four-tier architecture (col. 17, lines 10-12; wherein the database is the four-tier) for all interaction representations, the single container storing in which is stored at least one of the following representations of interaction context: representation of the terminals that can be used by users of the system, representations of modes of action, representation of the modes of perception of exchanges of information by the users, representation of activity of the users, representation of context, representation of services expected (abstract; col. 4, lines 8-20; FIG. 5, col. 16, lines 1-10); col. 20, lines 33-43); and

establishing with aid of this representation, a dialog between users and the services of the application (FIG. 5 ; 26, FIG. 1; wherein the communication device establishes the dialog)

11. De Angelo does not explicitly teaches creating a person-system interaction container (PSIC) for interaction by using the representations to construct, adapt and

manipulate knowledge bases constituting a structured representation of the context of use of the system.

12. Kautto-koivula teaches creating a personalized interaction environment / a person-system interaction container (PSIC) using the representations to construct, adapt and manipulate knowledge bases (abstract; paragraph 9; paragraph 90).

13. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify De Angelo 's invention with Kautto-koivula 's to provide creation of a person-system interaction container for interaction, because it would improve the efficiency of Angelo's system by allowing individual user to customize their own terminals in accordance with their own preferences and needs in order for users to choose a view that he finds most intuitive and easy to use a device (Kautto-koivula's; paragraph 9).

14. As to claim 2, De Angelo teaches, wherein all communications between the user interface and functions of an application are managed by the container (FIG. 2A; col. 9, lines 7-12).

15. As to claim 3, Kautto-koivula teaches at least one at least of the following knowledge bases: a domain of application, an application, user or users, a task, modes of perception and of action offered by the terminal (paragraph 9 and 73);.

16. As to claim 4, Kautto-koivula teaches, wherein the PSIC updates and uses a log of a dialog between user and the system (paragraph 81).

17. As to claim 10, Kautto-koivula teaches, wherein the applications and the interfaces are kept separated by the PSIC (FIG. 2; paragraph 53-54; 72).

18. As to claim 11, Kautto-koivula teaches, wherein the user's interface is provided by the PSIC which interprets any action on the interface and the PSIC generates calls to the application (FIG. 2; paragraph 5).

19. As to claim 7, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 above.

20. As to claims 8-9, they are rejected for the same reasons as claim 4 above.

21. As to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 above.

22. As to claim 13, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11 above.

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdou Karim Seye whose telephone number is 571-270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Li B. Zhen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Abdou Karim Seye/
Examiner, Art Unit 2194/Abdou
Karim Seye/
Examiner, Art Unit 2194